



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

91

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/804,900	02/24/1997	ROBERT MECHALEY JR.	06318/005001	1485
25243	7590	06/19/2006		EXAMINER
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP 3050 K STREET, NW SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20007			POINVIL, FRANTZY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 08/804,900
Filing Date: February 24, 1997
Appellant(s): MECHALEY ET AL.

MAILED

JUN 19 2006

GROUP 3600

David R. Yohannan
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/17/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 7/15/2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Abelow US Patent No. 5,999,908 December 7, 1999

Majmudar et al. EPA 0 365 200 A2 March 04, 1990

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abelow (US Patent No. 5,999,908) in view of Majmudar et al (EPA 0 365 200 A3).

As per claims 1-7 and 25, Abelow is directed to a system and method of monitoring a product/service being used by a customer. A module is integrated within the product/service for monitoring usage of the product and for providing reports and market data and customer needs to a remote vendor. See column 16, lines 52-60, 9, lines 37-46 and column 10, line 3 to column 12, line 34 of Abelow. The various products/services described by Abelow include various components and subcomponents. Usage data of the product and its various components and subcomponents is collected and analyzed in order to determine future customer's needs. Abelow further teaches providing users with additional products and services while they are using a current product. See column 13, lines 55-58. Abelow states that "As the Customer uses the product 16, pre-programmed trigger points are checked in the CB-PD Module or by the Customer. If a trigger point has not been reached, the

Customer's use is not interrupted. If a trigger point is reached, the CB-PD Module requests the Customer's participation in a Development interaction". See column 17, line 55 to column 18, line 10. Abelow further states that customers' desires are inputted by the customers only for future development and consideration. Abelow teaches alerting a customer or user on possible future availability of identified software component wherein the identified component is not within the subset of software component. Alerting the user to a [current] availability of the identified software component, wherein the identified component is not within the subset of software component is not explicitly stated by Abelow.

Majmudar teaches a telecommunication system with subscriber controlled features modification. See the title. Majmudar provides a system which allows a user using a product/service to select features to be added to the user's current subscription. See the abstract. Once the desired features are selected, a remote central office transmits an appropriate software package containing selected features to the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Majmudar into the system of Abelow in order to allow a user to also select additional features or the availability of an identified software component wherein the identified component is not within the subset of software components. The motivation would have been to instantly allow users to make changes in their current usage of a product/service thereby permitting great flexibility of a product/service for better customer service and loyalty.

Collecting demographic and geographic data and threshold data are taught in the combination of Abelow and Majmudar.

As per claim 8, a user in the system of Majmudar interactively communicates by a visual communication and tactile response mechanism.

Claim 26 recites limitations contained in claim 1 and these limitations are likewise rejected. Claim 26 further includes features that the usage data pattern in an indicative of frequency of usage. As per this feature, the Examiner asserts that market analysis data usually includes usage data pattern indicative of frequency of usage or purchase of a product/service. It is noted that Abelow tracks usage data of a particular product/service. The usage data being an indicative of frequency of usage would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do in the combination of Abelow and Majmudar in order to provide associated vendors with data that can be useful in a market analysis system so as to improve the product and/or provide better customer service.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's representative states that "Abelow (US 5,999,908) is concerned with collecting data indicative of the user's preferences to design products on dependence on user feedback, Abelow, Col. 71, lines 5- 7, (some of which is explicitly requested and entered, some of which is implicitly collected, via "probes), thereby providing a means of enabling the products to evolve in a customer-focused manner. Id. at Col. 71, lines 19 - 22."

In response, Appellant admits that Abelow teaches collecting usage data describing user interaction with a subset of software components since Abelow collects usage data by means of a module being attached to a product or service being used by the user. The module also stores the collected data to be analyzed.

Abelow teach the claimed functions of "providing a computer system with a subset of software components from said set of software components; collecting usage data describing user interaction with the subset of software components" and "analyzing said usage data so as to identify a usage data pattern". See also columns 71-72.

Appellant then states that "Since Abelow is concerned with providing a system in respect of which products can evolve, any upgrades that are offered to the user are different to the software modules that the user was issued with in the first instance (and in relation to which the data collected is performed)" and "Thus does not disclose "provision of software components from a set of software components, wherein composition of the set is predefined".

In response, Abelow states that "The module being attached to a product or service includes means for storing and collecting a customer's usage of the product and transmits collected data to a remote vendor using a transmission medium. The module also includes entry means and voice and speaker means for interacting with the consumer" (see column 10, line 50 to column 11, line 8). On column 10, lines 10-15, it is stated "Built-in electronic mail lets them receive additional on-line services from those professionals 772, 726, 734 (such as validation of a product's set of dialogs) or buy additional services and data from them". Thus, the module analyzes user's interaction with a product during a customer's usage of the product. See column 9, lines 38-40 where it is stated "The CB-PD Module 670 obtains its findings while customers

are in the middle of product uses 668, during their real situations and needs" and column 17, line 52 to column 18, line 37 and column 19, line 28 to column 20, line 27 where Abelow teaches a vendor may deliver dynamic product improvements through on-line communications built into the product, to upgrade existing products in the field while they are in the hands of customers".

In so far as noted, Abelow teaches providing software functionality as an instant upgrade to an existing product and also as an upgrade of a future development of the software product.

Appellant then argues that the Office action suggests that Abelow teaches providing users with additional products and services by citing column 13, lines 55-58. Appellant then argues that this passage deals with only point of use transactions where the customer directly requests additional products and that although Abelow describes the collecting of data indicative of the user/customer's preferences Abelow uses the collected data to design products in dependence on user feedback which is how the system enables the products to evolve in a customer-focused manner.

In response, Abelow does provide this teaching. Additionally Abelow teaches delivering "dynamic product improvements through on-line communications built into the product, to upgrade existing products in the field while they are in the hands of customers". See column 20, lines 19-23 of Abelow. The software or products that users of the Abelow system are using include a subset of software functionality from a set of available functions since users are using the software or product into which the module is installed and the system of Abelow provides users with additional features being delivered to them immediately upon request (column 20, lines 6-9), and the system provides users the opportunity to purchase on-line additional services

and data (column 10, lines 10-15 of Abelow). Abelow also teaches the claimed "collecting data describing user interaction with the subset of software product functionality" by collecting usage data of a product or software (see column 19, line 20 to column 20, line 30 of Abelow).

Appellant then argues that Abelow does not disclose collecting and analyzing usage data that describes user interaction with a subset of (a predefined set of)software components to identify a usage data pattern.

The Examiner disagrees with the appellant's assertion because when the user is using a particular software, the user is only using dedicated segments of the software product related to the task that that particular segment is designed to perform. In addition, Abelow states "As the Customer uses the product 16, pre-programmed trigger points are checked in the CB-PD Module or by the Customer. If a trigger point has not been reached, the customer's use is not interrupted. If a trigger point is reached, the CB-PD Module requests the customer's participation in a Development interaction". See column 17, line 55 to column 18, line 10. Thus, Abelow clearly teaches collecting and analyzing usage data that describes user interaction with a subset of a predefined set of software components to identify a usage data pattern.

It is noted that Abelow teaches providing software functionality as an instant to an existing product and also as an upgrade of a future development of the software product. Both the instant functions and the future functionalities are interpreted as a second, different software component, wherein both components being with a predefined set of software components. The alerting and selection of the different component is not explicitly indicated in Abelow.

Majmudar discloses a telecommunication system and method "for allowing a subscriber to select telephone features from the subscriber terminal". "The subscriber terminal includes a touch screen display and a customer premises computer. The terminal, in response to a touching of the appropriate area of the screen, displays a list of all possible telephone features available to this subscriber terminal together with an indication of currently subscribed features. By touching the screen in the appropriate areas, the subscriber may select features to be added or deleted. The information regarding the subscriber selection is transmitted to the central office to which the terminal is connected. The central office maintains a set of software packages corresponding to each of the possible combinations of features to be selected by a subscriber and in response to information from the terminal defining a new set of features, the central office transmits the appropriate software package to the terminal. From then on, the terminal is reconfigured to provide the newly selected set of features". See the abstract of Majmudar.

Appellant then argues that Majmudar does not cure the deficiencies of Abelow by failing to disclose:

"collecting usage data describing user interaction with the subset of software components"

"analyzing said usage data so as to identify a usage data pattern"

"analyzing said usage data so as to identify a usage data pattern indicative of frequency of usage"

"identifying a software component from the set based on said identified usage data pattern and predetermined rules specifying a relationship between usage of a first software

component and selection of a second, different, software component, both said components being within said predefined set of software components".

In response, Majmudar had not been applied to denote teachings of the collecting and analyzing functions. These were noted to be taught or rendered obvious over Abelow. The identifying of a different software component based on usage data and predetermined rules were also noted to be taught or rendered obvious over Abelow as noted above. Majmudar has been used to denote teachings of a consumer using a product and selecting different additional features of that product. See the abstract of Majmudar.

Appellant's argument that Majmudar does not alerting to an availability of said identified software component since instead of the alerting being performed in dependence of previously performed monitoring and analyzing of usage data, the user has to pull information relating to the available software components.

In response, appellant is referred to the above noted paragraphs where it has been discussed that Abelow alerts users of available functions of a user's product which is being used by the user. Abelow collects usage data information and alerts users of both instant functionalities to be delivered online and further functionalities to be delivered at a future time. The user selecting a second and different software functionality is taught by Majmudar.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Majmudar into the system of Abelow in order to allow a user to also select additional features or the availability of an identified software component wherein the identified component is not within the subset of software components. The motivation would

have been to instantly allow users to make changes in their current usage of a product/service thereby permitting great flexibility of a product/service for better customer service and loyalty.

Appellant then argues that the Examiner's motivation is not found in either Abelow or Majmudar and that the Examiner is using hindsight to support the Examiner's rationale.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Abelow teaches alerting a user of a product functions to instantly upgrade the product in user or to upgrade the product in use in the further by detecting usage pattern. Majmudar clearly teaches allowing a user to select new and available different functions as an upgrade to a product or service being used by the user. See the abstract of Majmudar. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abelow with Majmudar since Abelow indicates that their module can be embedded in any particular product or service for detecting and analyzing usage data and is capable of alerting users of an availability of a different instant or future function of the product. Steps or functions of identifying for selection available different functions of a product being used by a user of a product are taught by Majmudar. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Abelow with Majmudar in order to allow a user to obtain instant different functionalities of a product as would be desired thus, maintaining a loyal customer. Thus, the Examiner's analysis is not based on improper hindsight or motivation, but is based on rationale that would have been made by one of ordinary skilled in the art when viewing Abelow and Majmudar taken in combination.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Frantzy Poinvil

Conferees:


Frantzy Poinvil

Sam Sough 

Nga Nguyen



David R. Yohannan
COLLIER SHANNON SCOTT, PLLC
3050 K Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington DC 20007
(202) 342-8400